

F

"THE MILITARY PROFESSION"
Distaff Version

4-9-73

THIS IS THE FIRST CHANCE I HAVE HAD TO ADDRESS YOUR STRATEGY GROUP. / I REGRET THAT I HAD TO WAIT SO LONG. / THERE WERE THOSE WHO WONDERED / HOW MUCH YOU LADIES WOULD BE ABLE TO RELATE TO STRATEGY / AND SUCH PRINCIPLES AS BALANCE OF POWER, / COALITION ~~WARFARE~~ STRATEGY, AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT. / I FEEL THAT ANYONE WHO CAN KEEP A CHECKBOOK BALANCED ON MILITARY PAY, / CAN OFFER A GOOD ANSWER WHEN YOUR CHILD SAYS / "HEY MOM, LARRY JUST GAVE ME TWO HAMSTERS: / DADDY SAYS IT'S OKAY IF YOU SAY IT'S OKAY". / AND WHO CAN PREPARE TO ENTERTAIN ON A RAINY SATURDAY / WITH MUDDY KIDS TRAMPING THROUGH THE HOUSE / -- ~~YOU~~ ^{HAS} PROBABLY ~~HAVE~~ MORE WORKING KNOWLEDGE OF STRATEGY THAN WE DO.

PERHAPS IT IS ONLY FAIR THAT I START TONIGHT / BY EXPLAINING TO YOU WHY WE HAVE PACED YOUR HUSBANDS / THROUGH THIS ROUGH COURSE IN STRATEGY; / WHY WE HAVE CONCENTRATED ON CASE STUDIES OF MILITARY HISTORY.

THE BASIC REASON IS THAT THE KEY INGREDIENT TO MILITARY PROFESSIONALISM, / IN MY OPINION, IS AN ABILITY TO THINK LOGICALLY, DEEPLY AND FLEXIBLY. / THERE PERHAPS WAS A DAY IN MILITARY AFFAIRS / WHEN ONLY A FEW MEN AT THE TOP HAD TO BE DEEP THINKERS. / THE REST COULD FOLLOW STRAIGHTFORWARD /

AXIOMS OR DIRECTIVES. / COURAGE, INITIATIVE, DARING / AND LOTS
OF EXPERIENCE OR TRAINING / WERE OFTEN ADEQUATE. / TODAY THE
NEED TO THINK AND ANALYZE, / EVEN ON THE BATTLEFIELD, / GOES
DEEPER THAN EVER BEFORE. / WHAT GOOD, FOR INSTANCE, ARE
EXPERIENCE AND COURAGE / IN PLANNING HOW TO DETER NUCLEAR CON-
FLICT. NONE. / IT TAKES A MAN WHO CAN ESTIMATE COMPLEX
TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES / IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING ENVIRONMENT, /
THAT REQUIRES THE SKILLS OF A NUCLEAR PHYSICIST, / A MATHEMATI-
CIAN AND A SYSTEMS ANALYST. / IT ALSO TAKES A MAN WHO CAN
ESTIMATE / HOW THE ENEMY WILL VIEW THE SITUATION / AND WHAT WILL
DETER HIM FROM ATTACKING US. / THAT REQUIRES A SOCIOLOGIST
AND PSYCHOLOGIST. / YOUR HUSBAND MAY HAVE TO BE ALL OF THESE
THINGS / WRAPPED UP IN ONE. / IT IS TODAY CRITICALLY IMPORTANT
THAT HE BE A TRUE PROFESSIONAL. /

OUR PROFESSION IS THE MANAGEMENT OF VIOLENCE. / VIOLENCE
IS MORE DANGEROUS TODAY THAN EVER. / IF WE MANAGE WELL / THE
COUNTRY WILL HAVE A BETTER CHANCE / NOT TO FALL INTO THE USE
OF VIOLENCE / WITH ITS ATTENDANT RISKS. / HENCE, WE NEED MEN
LIKE YOUR HUSBANDS / WHO ARE TRUE PROFESSIONALS. /

HERE AT THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, / WE CANNOT TRAIN THEM IN
ALL OF THE SKILLS / OF NUCLEAR PHYSICIST, MATHEMATICIAN,

SOCIOLOGIST AND PSYCHOLOGIST. / THE COMMON DENOMINATOR, THOUGH, /
IS CLEAR THINKING. / I BELIEVE THAT OUR STRATEGY COURSE DEMANDS
THIS. / TO BEGIN WITH, IT PUTS ^{THE STUDENT} HIM ON HIS OWN. / INSTEAD OF
BEING SPOON-FED WITH LECTURES, / HE HAS HAD TO DIG IT OUT FOR
HIMSELF. / INSTEAD OF EMPHASIZING CURRENT THEORIES OF STRATEGY /
OR FACTUAL DATA THAT INFLUENCE TODAY'S OUTLOOK, / WE HAVE
FORCED HIM TO LOOK AT HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF STRATEGY, /
TODAYS FACTS AND FIGURES ARE FRAGILE ITEMS. / THE EXPERIENCES
OF YESTERDAY ARE THE BASIS / FOR LEARNING FROM THE MISTAKES
AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OTHERS. /

AT THE SAME TIME, / RECOGNIZE THAT WE CAN DRAW PARALLELS
OR ANALOGIES / FROM THE PAST ONLY WITH PERIL. / TOMORROW'S
EXPERIENCE CAN NEVER DUPLICATE YESTERDAY'S. /

THE PROCESS, THOUGH, OF DISSECTING YESTERDAY'S
HISTORY / TO DETERMINE WHAT IS APPLICABLE TO TODAY, / ALSO FORCES
US TO DISSECT TODAY / AND TO LEARN WHAT FORCES ARE REALLY AT
WORK. /

HEREIN LIES THE MAIN VALUE OF OUR HISTORICAL APPROACH, /
IT IS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MENTAL ATTITUDES / FOR TACKLING A
PROBLEM. /

IT IS ~~IN~~ THIS HABIT OF DISSECTION.

IT IS THE DESIRE TO SEARCH FOR WHAT IS TRUE.

IT IS THE RECOGNITION OF A NEED FOR OBJECTIVITY.

IT IS PATIENCE AND A WILLINGNESS TO PROBE AND
PROBE FOR ALL THE FACTORS THAT APPEAR TO BE
RELEVANT.

HOPEFULLY, IT IS ALSO APPRECIATING THAT THE ISSUES OF
STRATEGY ARE FAR FROM BLACK AND WHITE, RIGHT OR WRONG.
TODAY'S ENEMY IS TOMORROW'S ALLY. TODAY'S HERESY IS
TOMORROW'S DOGMA.

~~YOU AND YOUR HUSBAND HAVE ALSO COME HERE THROUGH HISTORY
TO DEVELOP A SENSE OF THRILL AND OF INTELLECTUAL SATISFACTION
IN PROBING THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF STRATEGY. AND TO GAIN THE
EVEN GREATER SATISFACTION OF USING YOUR SOLUTIONS TO DEVELOP
YOUR IDEAS OF VIABLE STRATEGIES FOR TOMORROW.~~

WE COULD HAVE OFFERED YOU A MORE COMPLETE PICTURE BY
OFFERING A COURSE IN HISTORICAL STRATEGIC THEORIES FROM SUN
TZU TO CLAUSEWITZ TO MAHAN TO DOUHET TO MACKINDER TO MAO AND
OTHERS YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF STRATEGY WOULD NOT BE ANY DEEPER
TODAY, EVEN THOUGH SUPERFICIALLY IT MIGHT SEEM MORE COMPLETE

Handwritten: *Heard. sh*
OR COHERENT. WORSE THAN THAT / YOU MIGHT LEAVE HERE BELIEVING /
THAT YOU HAD AN ADEQUATE GRASP OF STRATEGY. / THAT WOULD BE A
CATASTROPHE. / *They* YOU WILL ONLY BECOME A STRATEGIST / IF YOU CON-
uh TINUALLY PROBE THE PAST / AS PART OF YOUR EXAMINATION OF THE
EVER-CHANGING PRESENT. AND TODAY'S TRUE ^{MILITARY} PROFESSIONAL MUST
BE A STRATEGIST. / *Not just - interest - talent - tools -*
Our Purpose YOUR MERE PRESENCE HERE TONIGHT / IS WITNESS TO THE FACT
THAT YOUR HUSBANDS / ARE PART OF A DISTINGUISHED PROFESSION, /
NOT A CRAFT OR TRADE. / A PROFESSION HAS A HISTORY. / A LAWYER
OR A DOCTOR MUST KNOW FROM WHENCE HIS SKILLS DERIVE. / IT'S
A FULL TIME JOB. / A PLUMBER OR A MASON CAN WORK AN EIGHT-
HOUR DAY, / A FORTY-HOUR WEEK, THEN SHED HIS WORK CLOTHES / AND
LEAVE THE JOB BEHIND. / HE NEEDS ONLY TO LEARN THE SPECIFIC
SKILLS OF HIS TRADE. / THE MILITARY MAN, OF COURSE, REQUIRES
CERTAIN TECHNICAL SKILLS. / BUT, AS YOU ALL WELL KNOW, / THERE
IS MUCH MORE TO IT THAN THAT. / HIS WORK IS WITH HIM NO MATTER
WHERE HIS WORK CLOTHES ARE. / THE WIFE OF A CARPENTER DOES NOT
NEED TO KNOW HIS TRADE. / SHE IS SELDOM WITH HIM WHEN HE
PRACTICES IT. / YOU ARE DIFFERENT. / YOU WIVES MUST FULLY COM-
PREHEND / WHY YOUR HUSBANDS ARE SO OFTEN CALLED UPON / TO PERFORM
THE STRANGE FUNCTIONS OF THEIR CALLING. / THEY NEED YOUR SUPPORT. /
THAT IS WHY I HAVE BEEN SO ELATED AT THE TURNOUT / FOR ALL

IN ITS STARKEST COLORS, / A LARGE PART OF THE GENIUS OF
MILITARY LEADERSHIP / HAS ALWAYS BEEN TO MOTIVATE MEN TO WORK
AND TO SACRIFICE / FOR GOALS THEY NEVER UNDERSTAND, / AND WHICH
OFTEN ARE IN FACT INCOMPREHENSIBLE. / I AM NOT TALKING ONLY
OF HERIOCS / I AM TALKING ABOUT
ESSENTIAL TASKS / THAT ALL OF YOUR HUSBANDS HAVE PERFORMED, / SUCH
AS MOTIVATING A MESS COOK OR A BILGE CLEANER / TO BELIEVE THAT
WHAT HE DOES HAS A VITAL PURPOSE, / MANY TIMES THAT PURPOSE IS
THE SELF-AGGRANDIZEMENT OF THE LEADER HIMSELF. /

FOR INSTANCE, I ONCE HAD COMMAND OF A SHIP / THAT WAS SCHEDULED
FOR A MAJOR MODERNIZATION IN SIX MONTHS, / ALMOST THE ENTIRE SUPER-
STRUCTURE OF THE SHIP / WOULD BE TORN OFF AND REPLACED, / YET,
FOR SIX MONTHS I MANAGED TO MOTIVATE MY CREW TO REPAIR, /
REHABILITATE AND MAINTAIN THAT SUPERSTRUCTURE. / ON THE VERY
DAY THAT THE SHIP ARRIVED IN THE SHIPYARD / THE CREW WERE STILL
WELDING AND PAINTING ON IT. / I EVEN FOUND ONE MAN ACTUALLY
LAYING NEW TILE ON THE DECK OF A PAINT LOCKER / WHICH WOULD
BE DEMOLISHED WITHIN DAYS. / DID IT REALLY MAKE SENSE? / WHY
DID I DO IT? / OF COURSE, BECAUSE I WANTED TO ENHANCE MY
REPUTATION AND CAREER. / BUT--WEREN'T THOSE MEN BETTER OFF
HAVING SOME SENSE OF PURPOSE AND INTEREST / THAN BEING LEFT

AIMLESS MIDST DETERIORATION AND INDIFFERENCE? / ARE THEY
TODAY, PERHAPS, BETTER SAILORS OR CITIZENS / BECAUSE THEY
LEARNED THAT IT IS PREFERABLE TO DO YOUR BEST / AND TO FEEL
PROUD / RATHER THAN TAKE THE LINE OF LEAST RESISTANCE? /

BUT WHERE DOES THE LINE BETWEEN PROPER / AND SELF-SERVING
LEADERSHIP RIGHTLY FALL? / WHAT IF I HAD BEEN ASKING SOME OF
THOSE MEN TO SACRIFICE THEIR LIVES / OR THEIR INTEGRITY TO WIN
ME AND MY SHIP THE HONORS? /

A CLOSELY RELATED QUESTION IS WHETHER WE AS MILITARY
LEADERS / CAN SUCCEED IN GETTING MEN TO RISK THEIR LIVES / WITH-
OUT OUR WAVING SOME SYMBOL OF PATRIOTISM. / CAN WE, INTELLIGENT
AND THINKING MILITARY LEADERS / GET THE REQUIRED PERFORMANCE
FROM OUR MEN / USING ONLY REASON AND LOGIC / --OR DO WE ALL NEED
TO WAVE EMOTIONAL SYMBOLS / TO PROPEL MEN INTO THE BASICALLY
IRRATIONAL ACTS OF WAR? / WHAT ARE A MILITARY MAN'S OBLIGATIONS
TO RATIONALITY--? / TO LOYALTY TO HIS SERVICE, / TO HIS COMRADES,
TO HIS COUNTRY? / WHAT DO WE DO WHEN OUR SENSE OF INTEGRITY
AND LOYALTY CONFLICT? /

*Suggest as health dilemma - private
& public morality*

NOW WE ARE BY NO MEANS THE ONLY PERSONS WHO FACE THIS
DILEMMA. / EVERY BUSINESSMAN HAS HIS PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES
OR MORALTY / BUT THERE IS A BIG DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SAYING: /
"WHAT IS GOOD FOR GENERAL MOTORS / IS GOOD FOR THE U.S.A." /
AND SOMETHING LIKE: / *Preservation*
"NATIONAL SECURITY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE PREVENTION
OF OUR WAY OF LIFE" /

THE FORMER IS USUALLY QUOTED IN DERISION, / EVEN THOUGH THERE
IS AN ELEMENT OF TRUTH IN IT. / THE LATTER HAS A GREAT DEAL OF
TRUTH IN IT, / BUT HOW MANY TIMES IS IT QUOTED IN SUPPORT OF QUES-
TIONABLE CAUSES? / THAT, IT SEEMS TO ME IS THE ESSENCE OF THE
ISSUE / OF THE PUBLIC MORALITY OF MILITARY MEN. / THAT IS, HOW
OFTEN DO WE TAKE ADVANTAGE / OF THE GREATER FREEDOM THAT MAKING
APPEALS TO PATRIOTISM GIVES US. / WE WORK FOR THE STATE. / THE
FUNDAMENTAL PROPOSITION OF A STATE / IS THAT IT ATTEMPTS TO
PRESERVE ITSELF / AND THEREFORE THE WELL-BEING OF ITS CITIZENS. /
AS A RESULT WE COMMONLY CONDONE ACTIONS BY A STATE / THAT WOULD
CONTRAVENE OUR SENSE OF PRIVATE MORALITY. / WAR ITSELF IS ONE

EXAMPLE. / PURPOSEFUL DECEIT IS ANOTHER. / LET US TAKE THE RECENT CASE OF GENERAL LAVELLE, / THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF SEVENTH AIR FORCE IN VIETNAM, / IT APPEARS THAT HE DECEIVED HIS SUPERIORS / AND EXCEEDED HIS AUTHORITY. / THIS CLEARLY VIOLATES OUR SENSE OF PRIVATE MORALITY. / WHY DID HE DO IT? / FOR PERSONAL GAIN OR GLORY? / IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT WAY TO ME. /

CURIOUSLY, I HAVE NEVER HEARD A NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST SUGGEST IT. / THEY HAVE NOT EVEN ASKED THIS QUESTION / OR WONDERED WHY HE DID WHAT IT IS AVERRED HE DID DO. / THE WRITERS IMMEDIATELY ASSUMED / THAT BECAUSE HIS ACTIONS APPARENTLY VIOLATED OUR STANDARDS OF PRIVATE MORALITY, / HE WAS DESERVING OF CONDEMNATION. / PERHAPS IN GENERAL LAVELLE'S VIEW / HE ACTED BECAUSE HIS SENSE OF PUBLIC MORALITY / JUSTIFIED WHAT HE DID. / PERHAPS HE FELT THAT THE NATION'S INTERESTS WERE ENDANGERED / BY PROLONGING THE WAR AND WASTING LIVES / BECAUSE OF THE WAY THAT WE WERE FIGHTING? /

CAN WE NOT IN SOME SENSE SYMPATHIZE WITH A MAN / WHO AT LEAST APPEARED TO BE TRYING / TO SERVE HIS NATION'S SECURITY? / EVEN PERHAPS ACCEPTING THE RESPONSIBILITY / AND RISK OF DISAVOWAL AND

DISHONOR/TO ACHIEVE WHAT SEEMED TO HIM/TO BE IMPORTANT
TO THE COUNTRY./

BUT, TOO, ARE NOT LOYALTY AND OBEDIENCE/THE HIGHEST MILITARY
VIRTUES?/ DO WE NOT AS PROFESSIONALS ABHOR PRECEDENTS/ THAT BREAK
DOWN THE FUNDAMENTAL PRECEPT OF SUBORDINATION/IN OUR MILITARY
WAY OF LIFE?/

AND AT THAT PARTICULAR MOMENT/WAS NOT GENERAL LAVELLE
CLEARLY RUNNING COUNTER/TO WHAT THE CITIZENS OF THE COUNTRY
WOULD SUPPORT/ AS BEING IN THE INTEREST OF THEIR SECURITY?/ DID
HE, THEN, NOT HURT THE IMAGE AND REPUTATION/OF OUR ENTIRE
PROFESSION,/ AND IN SO DOING VITALLY DAMAGE /OUR ABILITY TO
PRESERVE THE SECURITY OF THE NATION?/

I SUPPOSE THAT THE KEY QUESTION/WHICH WE SHOULD ASK OURSELVES
IS:/ DID GENERAL LAVELLE THINK THROUGH /THESE IMPLICATIONS OF HIS
ACTIONS/BEFORE HE TOOK THEM?/

DO EACH OF US CAREFULLY CONSIDER THE POSSIBLE CONFLICTS/OF
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MORALITY/BEFORE WE ACT?/ ARE WE AWARE THAT
WE HAVE CHOICES TO MAKE/THAT ARE ONLY BLURRED BY STIRRING
SLOGANS /SUCH AS "WHAT'S GOOD FOR GENERAL MOTORS /... " OR
"NATIONAL SECURITY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE PRESERVATION/... " CAN
WE LAY DOWN RULES FOR CONDUCT /IN SITUATIONS SUCH AS THAT IN
WHICH/GENERAL LAVELLE FOUND HIMSELF?/ WHEN LOYALTY, PROSPECTS
FOR PROMOTION,/ PUBLIC ACCLAIM OR OTHER FACTORS IMPINGE/ON WHAT
OUR PRIVATE CONSCIENCE TELLS US IS MORAL/ OR RIGHT OR LEGAL?/

OBVIOUSLY, THERE IS NO EASY ANSWER. IN MY PERSONAL VIEW
THERE CAN BE NO RIGID FORMULA.

BE SURE, TOO, THAT YOU APPRECIATE THAT WE ARE NOT TALK-
ING OF ISSUES THAT ARE CONFINED TO FOUR STAR OFFICERS. THESE
CONFLICTS OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC MORALITY ARE WITH EACH OFFICER
FROM THE DAY HE ACCEPTS HIS COMMISSION. YOU SIMPLY CANNOT
LIVE IN AN ATMOSPHERE WHERE THE GLORIOUS PURPOSE OF THE ORGA-
NIZATION PERMITS SOME VIOLATIONS OF PRIVATE MORALITY WITHOUT
IT SUBTLY AFFECTING OTHER STANDARDS.

YOU WIVES PLAY A VITAL ROLE IN THIS AREA. WE SPEAK OF
THE LONLINESS OF COMMAND--HOW THE OFFICER AT THE TOP, WHETHER
A DEPARTMENT HEAD ON A DESTROYER, COMMANDING OFFICER OR UNIT
COMMANDER, HAS TO MAKE UP HIS OWN MIND. HE CAN'T PASS THE
BUCK UPWARDS OR SHOW INDECISIVENESS TO HIS JUNIORS. QUITE
OFTEN, IF YOU ARE STATIONED WITH HIM, YOU ARE HIS ONLY SOUND-
ING BOARD ON SUCH MORAL ISSUES. HOW ARE YOU EQUIPPED TO HELP
HIM? WHAT INFLUENCES YOUR VIEWS, A SIMPLISTIC BLACK AND
WHITE PICTURE OF GOOD AND EVIL? OR A REALISTIC UNDERSTANDING OF
THE CONFLICTS WHICH EXIST IN THE REAL WORLD IN WHICH YOUR
HUSBAND OPERATES?

ONE TYPE OF CONFLICT THAT YOUR HUSBANDS READ ABOUT IS
THAT BETWEEN TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE AND TRADITION--BETWEEN

"WE'VE ALWAYS DONE IT THIS WAY" AND "WHY NOT. . . ." PROFESSOR ELTING MORISON PROVIDED SEVERAL ANECDOTES ALONG THIS LINE IN HIS BOOK. HE WAS AS CRITICAL OF THE CIVILIAN WORLD AS OF THE MILITARY. WHERE IS THE LINE BETWEEN RESISTING IMPROVEMENTS OR THE INEVITABLE, AND MISTAKING CHANGE FOR IMPROVEMENTS. MORISON AVERS THAT THE MILITARY AS AN INSTITUTION IS A SOCIETY THAT INHERENTLY RESISTS CHANGE TOO STUBORNLY.

HIS THEORY IS THAT WE ARE A SMALL SOCIETY UNTO OURSELVES, A CLIQUE; THAT ANY SOCIETY HAS AN INSTINCT FOR SELF-PRESERVATION, AND THAT PEOPLE ARE MORE CONFIDENT OF PRESERVING THEIR STATUS IF THINGS DO NOT CHANGE MUCH. HE HAS SOME CHOICE STORIES THAT SEEM TO BEAR THIS OUT.

ONE OF THESE INVOLVED ONE OF MY PREDECESSORS HERE AS PRESIDENT OF THE WAR COLLEGE, ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS (WHO ALSO HAPPENED TO BE THE FATHER-IN-LAW OF THE AUTHOR OF THE BOOK) AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY CAPTAIN SIMS UNCOVERED A WAY TO MAKE A SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT IN NAVAL GUNNERY. THE NAVY SOCIETY OFFERED ONLY UNREMITTING RESISTANCE. WHY? BECAUSE OUR NAVAL SOCIETY WAS STUPID? OR PROUD? NO-- BECAUSE THE PEOPLE WHO RESISTED HIM IDENTIFIED THE NAVY WITH PARTICULAR EQUIPMENTS AND PROCEDURES THAT WERE PART OF THEIR

OWN PERSONAL EXPERIENCE. / THEY SAW A CHALLENGE TO THOSE
PARTICULARITIES / AS NOTHING LESS THAN A CHALLENGE TO THE
NAVY ITSELF / AS FAR AS THEY WERE CONCERNED. / CAN YOU IMAGINE
SOMEONE WALKING IN TODAY / AND TELLING US THAT ALL SHIPS ARE
OUTMODED? / --THAT THERE ARE NEW WAYS TO DO A NAVY'S TASKS? / DO
YOU THINK / THAT OUR NAVAL SOCIETY / WOULD RECEIVE HIM WITH OPEN
MINDEDNESS AND JOY? /

BUT SIMS DID SUCCEED. HOW? / HE APPEALED TO AUTHORITY
OUTSIDE THE NAVY. / TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. /
THIS LED TO A GENERALIZATION BY ADMIRAL MAHAN / THAT NO MILI-
TARY SERVICE SHOULD OR COULD UNDERTAKE TO REFORM ITSELF. / IT
MUST SEEK ASSISTANCE FROM OUTSIDE. / DO YOU REALIZE THAT? / IS
IT TRUE TODAY? / DO YOU WANT TO ADMIT THAT WE CANNOT SHAPE /
OUR OWN DESTINY FROM WITHIN? / AND IF WE CAN NOT, / HOW IN THE
WORLD DO WE OBTAIN / THAT OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE? / IN INDUSTRY YOU
CAN TURN TO SOME OUTSIDER / AND INVITE HIM IN / AT THE TOP. / WE
SELDOM HAVE INFUSED GENERALS OR ADMIRALS / FROM OUTSIDE OUR
TIGHT LITTLE SOCIETY. / IF MORISON AND MAHAN ARE RIGHT, / SHOULD
WE BRING / IN 50% / OF EACH YEAR'S CROP OF FLAG AND
GENERAL OFFICERS FROM CIVILIAN LIFE? / CAN WE DO THAT IN WHAT
WE CALL A PROFESSION? /

ANOTHER CASE OF RESISTANCE TO CHANGE IN MORISON'S BOOK/
IS THE AMAZING TALE OF THE USS WAMPANOAG/ (NAMED FOR AN INDIAN
TRIBE FROM THIS PART OF THE COUNTRY). SHE WAS COMMISSIONED
IN 1868. / SHE WAS STEAM PROPELLED / SHE COULD TRAVEL AT 20
KNOTS, / WHICH WAS 5 KNOTS FASTER THAN ANYTHING AFLOAT. / THIS
IS A 33% SPEED ADVANTAGE. / TODAY WE ARE PAYING HUGE SUMS
FOR FAR LESSER SPEED ADVANTAGES. / WHAT DID WE DO WITH THE
WAMPANOAG, / A SHIP THAT COULD RUN CIRCLES / AROUND ABSOLUTELY
ANY OTHER VESSEL AFLOAT? / IN 1869, JUST A YEAR AFTER HER
COMMISSIONING / WE LAID HER UP / AND, LATER STILL, WE SOLD HER. /
WE DID NOT BUILD A SHIP OF HER SPEED AND MANEUVERABILITY / FOR
ANOTHER 20 YEARS. / WHY? PROFESSOR MORISON SUGGESTS THAT THE
NAVY HAD NO CONCEPT / OF WHY IT NEEDED SUCH A SHIP. / IT HAD
NO MISSION INTO WHICH HER CAPABILITIES FITTED. / THE REASONS
GIVEN FOR ELIMINATING HER WERE SPECIOUS. / BUT PERHAPS THE
NAVAL SOCIETY / WAS ACTUALLY REACTING WITH LOGIC AFTER ALL. /
AT LEAST UNTIL IT HAD THE FORESIGHT / TO SEE WHERE THE NAVY
SHOULD BE GOING / AND WHETHER IT NEEDED WAMPANOAG. /

WHERE DO WE GO NEXT? / WHAT ARE TODAY'S ANACHRONISMS? /
YOUR HUSBANDS, WITH YOUR HELP, / ARE GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE
THESE DECISIONS. / THEY ARE THE ONES WHOSE TASK IT WILL BE /
TO SET THE COURSE FOR THE MILITARY OF THE FUTURE / TO DO

THIS THEY WILL REQUIRE A FINE KNOWLEDGE, NOT ONLY OF WHERE WE HAVE BEEN, AND OF WHAT OUR STRATEGY SHOULD BE, BUT OF HOW BEST TO MOLD TECHNOLOGY AND HARDWARE INTO THESE PLANS. IF A WAMPANOAG SHOWS UP TOMORROW, ON HYDROFOILS OR AS AN AIR CUSHION VEHICLE, OR SUBMERGED--THEY MUST RECOGNIZE IT AND KNOW ITS PLACE. FURTHERMORE, THEY MUST FIND THE MONEY IN OUR COMPETITIVE BUDGET FOR THESE NEW ITEMS AND SELL THEM IN THE WASHINGTON ARENA. THIS BRINGS US TO THE NEXT PORTION OF OUR NAVAL WARFARE COURSE. WE WILL START THE MANAGEMENT STUDY AFTER CHRISTMAS BY ADDRESSING THE NECESSITY FOR DEFINING THE PURPOSES AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MILITARY FORCES--PARTICULARLY OF NAVAL FORCES. YOUR HUSBANDS WILL THEN STUDY THE MACHINATIONS AND NUANCES OF THE BUREAUCRATIC BUDGETARY WORLD THAT SO HEAVILY DEFINE AND CONSTRAIN OUR FORCES.

I AM CONVINCED THAT WE NEED A STRONG MILITARY FORCE, NOT ONE FULL OF MILITARISTIC ANACHRONISMS, BUT ONE WHICH IS CREATIVE AND RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF OUR SOCIETY. I AM CONVINCED THAT YOUR HUSBANDS WILL BE BETTER QUALIFIED FOR THIS TASK BY HAVING ATTENDED THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE. AND, MOST IMPORTANT, THE OFFICERS WHOSE WIVES ARE IN THIS AUDIENCE WILL BE BEST QUALIFIED BECAUSE YOU LADIES HAVE CARED ENOUGH ABOUT WHAT THEY ARE DOING TO DEVOTE YOUR PRECIOUS TIME HERE.

LET ME CLOSE WITH A QUOTE FROM A LETTER FROM THE

WHO HAD BEEN ABOARD HIS SHIP. THE BOY WAS
INTERESTED IN ANNAPOLIS, AND IN THE NAVY AS A CAREER. THE
COMMANDING OFFICER DESCRIBED ALL THE JOYS -- "THE FUN AND
ZEST" -- OF BEING A NAVAL OFFICER. THEN HE CAREFULLY
TEMPERED THE ADVERTISING WITH FACTS ON THE HARDSHIPS OF SUCH
A CAREER. HERE ARE THE WORDS:

"ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOU ASPIRE TO A SUCCESSFUL
CAREER AS AN UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER, YOU MUST THOROUGHLY
ENJOY THE PRACTICAL BUSINESS OF GOING TO SEA. SO MUCH SO
THAT YOU ARE WILLING TO SPEND NEARLY HALF OF YOUR LIFE AWAY
FROM YOUR HOME AND FAMILY. YOU MUST BE WILLING TO PLACE YOUR
RESPONSIBILITY TO YOUR SHIP ABOVE ALL OTHER DUTIES; AND YOU
WILL FIND THAT SHE IS A JEALOUS MISTRESS WITH UNENDING DEMANDS ON
YOUR TIME, ENERGIES AND ATTENTIONS. YOU MUST BE ABLE TO BOTH
GIVE AND CARRY OUT ORDERS WITH WHICH YOU MAY NOT WHOLEHEARTEDLY
AGREE AND, ESPECIALLY IN THE CONTEXT OF TODAY'S SOCIAL
ENVIRONMENT, BE WILLING TO ACCEPT THE FACT THAT YOUR CHOSEN
PROFESSION MAY NOT BE HELD IN HIGH ESTEEM BY THE COMMUNITY AT
LARGE. YOU MUST BELIEVE COMPLETELY IN THE VALUE AND IMPORTANCE
OF YOUR COMMITMENT. IF AND WHEN YOU MARRY, IT MUST BE TO A
WOMAN WHO HAS UNCOMMON COURAGE AND UNDERSTANDING AND WHO WOULD
RATHER HAVE A WHOLE MAN PART OF THE TIME THAN PART OF A MAN
ALL THE TIME, FOR SHE WILL BE EXPECTED TO CHEERFULLY ACCEPT
EVEN GREATER SACRIFICES THAN YOU."

LADIES, THANK YOU.

"THE MILITARY PROFESSION"
Distaff Version

4-9-73

THIS IS THE FIRST CHANCE I HAVE HAD TO ADDRESS YOUR STRATEGY GROUP. I REGRET THAT I HAD TO WAIT SO LONG. THERE WERE THOSE WHO WONDERED HOW MUCH YOU LADIES WOULD BE ABLE TO RELATE TO STRATEGY, AND SUCH PRINCIPLES AS BALANCE OF POWER, COALITION STRATEGY, AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT. I FEEL THAT ANYONE WHO CAN KEEP A CHECKBOOK BALANCED ON MILITARY PAY, CAN OFFER A GOOD ANSWER WHEN YOUR CHILD SAYS , "HEY MOM, LARRY JUST GAVE ME TWO HAMSTERS: DADDY SAYS IT'S OKAY IF YOU SAY IT'S OKAY", AND WHO CAN PREPARE TO ENTERTAIN ON A RAINY SATURDAY WITH MUDDY KIDS TRAMPING THROUGH THE HOUSE -- YOU PROBABLY HAVE MORE WORKING KNOWLEDGE OF STRATEGY THAN WE DO.

PERHAPS IT IS ONLY FAIR THAT I START TONIGHT BY EXPLAINING TO YOU WHY WE HAVE PACED YOUR HUSBANDS THROUGH THIS ROUGH COURSE IN STRATEGY; WHY WE HAVE CONCENTRATED ON CASE STUDIES OF MILITARY HISTORY.

THE BASIC REASON IS THAT THE KEY INGREDIENT TO MILITARY PROFESSIONALISM, IN MY OPINION, IS AN ABILITY TO THINK LOGICALLY, DEEPLY AND FLEXIBLY. | THERE PERHAPS WAS A DAY IN MILITARY AFFAIRS WHEN ONLY A FEW MEN AT THE TOP HAD TO BE DEEP THINKERS. THE REST COULD FOLLOW STRAIGHTFORWARD

AXIOMS OR DIRECTIVES. COURAGE, INITIATIVE, DARING AND LOTS OF EXPERIENCE OR TRAINING WERE OFTEN ADEQUATE. TODAY THE NEED TO THINK AND ANALYZE, EVEN ON THE BATTLEFIELD, GOES DEEPER THAN EVER BEFORE. WHAT GOOD, FOR INSTANCE, ARE EXPERIENCE AND COURAGE IN PLANNING HOW TO DETER NUCLEAR CONFLICT. NONE. IT TAKES A MAN WHO CAN ESTIMATE COMPLEX TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING ENVIRONMENT, THAT REQUIRES THE SKILLS OF A NUCLEAR PHYSICIST, A MATHEMATICIAN AND A SYSTEMS ANALYST. IT ALSO TAKES A MAN WHO CAN ESTIMATE HOW THE ENEMY WILL VIEW THE SITUATION AND WHAT WILL DETER HIM FROM ATTACKING US. THAT REQUIRES A SOCIOLOGIST AND PSYCHOLOGIST. YOUR HUSBAND MAY HAVE TO BE ALL OF THESE THINGS WRAPPED UP IN ONE. IT IS TODAY CRITICALLY IMPORTANT THAT HE BE A TRUE PROFESSIONAL.

OUR PROFESSION IS THE MANAGEMENT OF VIOLENCE. VIOLENCE IS MORE DANGEROUS TODAY THAN EVER. IF WE MANAGE WELL, THE COUNTRY WILL HAVE A BETTER CHANCE NOT TO FALL INTO THE USE OF VIOLENCE WITH ITS ATTENDANT RISKS. HENCE, WE NEED MEN LIKE YOUR HUSBANDS WHO ARE TRUE PROFESSIONALS.

HERE AT THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, WE CANNOT TRAIN THEM IN ALL OF THE SKILLS OF NUCLEAR PHYSICIST, MATHEMATICIAN,

SOCIOLOGIST AND PSYCHOLOGIST. THE COMMON DENOMINATOR, THOUGH, IS CLEAR THINKING. I BELIEVE THAT OUR STRATEGY COURSE DEMANDS THIS. TO BEGIN WITH, IT PUTS HIM ON HIS OWN. INSTEAD OF BEING SPOON-FED WITH LECTURES, HE HAS HAD TO DIG IT OUT FOR HIMSELF. INSTEAD OF EMPHASIZING CURRENT THEORIES OF STRATEGY OR FACTUAL DATA THAT INFLUENCE TODAY'S OUTLOOK, WE HAVE FORCED HIM TO LOOK AT HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF STRATEGY. TODAY'S FACTS AND FIGURES ARE FRAGILE ITEMS. THE EXPERIENCES OF YESTERDAY ARE THE BASIS FOR LEARNING FROM THE MISTAKES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OTHERS.

AT THE SAME TIME, RECOGNIZE THAT WE CAN DRAW PARALLELS OR ANALOGIES FROM THE PAST ONLY WITH PERIL. TOMORROW'S EXPERIENCE CAN NEVER DUPLICATE YESTERDAY'S.

THE PROCESS, THOUGH, OF DISSECTING YESTERDAY'S HISTORY TO DETERMINE WHAT IS APPLICABLE TO TODAY, ALSO FORCES US TO DISSECT TODAY AND TO LEARN WHAT FORCES ARE REALLY AT WORK.

HEREIN LIES THE MAIN VALUE OF OUR HISTORICAL APPROACH. IT IS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MENTAL ATTITUDES FOR TACKLING A PROBLEM.

IT IS IN THIS HABIT OF DISSECTION.

IT IS THE DESIRE TO SEARCH FOR WHAT IS TRUE.

IT IS THE RECOGNITION OF A NEED FOR OBJECTIVITY.

IT IS PATIENCE AND A WILLINGNESS TO PROBE AND
PROBE FOR ALL THE FACTORS THAT APPEAR TO BE
RELEVANT.

HOPEFULLY, IT IS ALSO APPRECIATING THAT THE ISSUES OF
STRATEGY ARE FAR FROM BLACK AND WHITE, RIGHT OR WRONG.
TODAY'S ENEMY IS TOMORROW'S ALLY. TODAY'S HERESY IS
TOMORROW'S DOGMA.

YOU AND YOUR HUSBAND HAVE ALSO COME HERE THROUGH HISTORY
TO DEVELOP A SENSE OF THRILL AND OF INTELLECTUAL SATISFACTION
IN PROBING THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF STRATEGY. AND TO GAIN THE
EVEN GREATER SATISFACTION OF USING YOUR SOLUTIONS TO DEVELOP
YOUR IDEAS OF VIABLE STRATEGIES FOR TOMORROW.

WE COULD HAVE OFFERED YOU A MORE COMPLETE PICTURE BY
OFFERING A COURSE IN HISTORICAL STRATEGIC THEORIES FROM SUN
TZU TO CLAUSEWITZ TO MAHAN TO DOUHET TO MACKINDER TO MAO AND
OTHERS, YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF STRATEGY WOULD NOT BE ANY DEEPER,
TODAY, EVEN THOUGH SUPERFICIALLY IT MIGHT SEEM MORE COMPLETE

OR COHERENT. WORSE THAN THAT, YOU MIGHT LEAVE HERE BELIEVING THAT YOU HAD AN ADEQUATE GRASP OF STRATEGY. THAT WOULD BE A CATASTROPHE. YOU WILL ONLY BECOME A STRATEGIST IF YOU CONTINUALLY PROBE THE PAST AS PART OF YOUR EXAMINATION OF THE EVER-CHANGING PRESENT. AND TODAY'S TRUE PROFESSIONAL MUST BE A STRATEGIST.

YOUR MERE PRESENCE HERE TONIGHT IS WITNESS TO THE FACT THAT YOUR HUSBANDS ARE PART OF A DISTINGUISHED PROFESSION, NOT A CRAFT OR TRADE. A PROFESSION HAS A HISTORY. A LAWYER OR A DOCTOR MUST KNOW FROM WHENCE HIS SKILLS DERIVE. IT'S A FULL TIME JOB. A PLUMBER OR A MASON CAN WORK AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY, A FORTY-HOUR WEEK, THEN SHED HIS WORK CLOTHES AND LEAVE THE JOB BEHIND. HE NEEDS ONLY TO LEARN THE SPECIFIC SKILLS OF HIS TRADE. THE MILITARY MAN, OF COURSE, REQUIRES CERTAIN TECHNICAL SKILLS. BUT, AS YOU ALL WELL KNOW, THERE IS MUCH MORE TO IT THAN THAT. HIS WORK IS WITH HIM NO MATTER WHERE HIS WORK CLOTHES ARE. THE WIFE OF A CARPENTER DOES NOT NEED TO KNOW HIS TRADE. SHE IS SELDOM WITH HIM WHEN HE PRACTICES IT. YOU ARE DIFFERENT. YOU WIVES MUST FULLY COMPREHEND WHY YOUR HUSBANDS ARE SO OFTEN CALLED UPON TO PERFORM THE STRANGE FUNCTIONS OF THEIR CALLING. THEY NEED YOUR SUPPORT. THAT IS WHY I HAVE BEEN SO ELATED AT THE TURNOUT FOR ALL THESE EVENING COURSES.

IN ITS STARKEST COLORS, A LARGE PART OF THE GENIUS OF MILITARY LEADERSHIP HAS ALWAYS BEEN TO MOTIVATE MEN TO WORK AND TO SACRIFICE FOR GOALS THEY NEVER UNDERSTAND, AND WHICH OFTEN ARE IN FACT INCOMPREHENSIBLE. I AM NOT TALKING ONLY OF HERIOCS -I AM TALKING ABOUT ESSENTIAL TASKS THAT ALL OF YOUR HUSBANDS HAVE PERFORMED, SUCH AS MOTIVATING A MESS COOK OR A BILGE CLEANER TO BELIEVE THAT WHAT HE DOES HAS A VITAL PURPOSE. MANY TIMES THAT PURPOSE IS THE SELF-AGGRANDIZEMENT OF THE LEADER HIMSELF.

FOR INSTANCE, I ONCE HAD COMMAND OF A SHIP THAT WAS SCHEDULED FOR A MAJOR MODERNIZATION IN SIX MONTHS. ALMOST THE ENTIRE SUPER-STRUCTURE OF THE SHIP WOULD BE TORN OFF AND REPLACED. YET, FOR SIX MONTHS I MANAGED TO MOTIVATE MY CREW TO REPAIR, REHABILITATE AND MAINTAIN THAT SUPERSTRUCTURE. ON THE VERY DAY THAT THE SHIP ARRIVED IN THE SHIPYARD THE CREW WERE STILL WELDING AND PAINTING ON IT. I EVEN FOUND ONE MAN ACTUALLY LAYING NEW TILE ON THE DECK OF A PAINT LOCKER WHICH WOULD BE DEMOLISHED WITHIN DAYS. DID IT REALLY MAKE SENSE? WHY DID I DO IT? OF COURSE, BECAUSE I WANTED TO ENHANCE MY REPUTATION AND CAREER. BUT--WEREN'T THOSE MEN BETTER OFF HAVING SOME SENSE OF PURPOSE AND INTEREST THAN BEING LEFT

AIMLESS MIDST DETERIORATION AND INDIFFERENCE? ARE THEY TODAY, PERHAPS, BETTER SAILORS OR CITIZENS BECAUSE THEY LEARNED THAT IT IS PREFERABLE TO DO YOUR BEST AND TO FEEL PROUD RATHER THAN TAKE THE LINE OF LEAST RESISTANCE?

BUT WHERE DOES THE LINE BETWEEN PROPER AND SELF-SERVING LEADERSHIP RIGHTLY FALL? WHAT IF I HAD BEEN ASKING SOME OF THOSE MEN TO SACRIFICE THEIR LIVES OR THEIR INTEGRITY TO WIN ME AND MY SHIP THE HONORS?

A CLOSELY RELATED QUESTION IS WHETHER WE AS MILITARY LEADERS CAN SUCCEED IN GETTING MEN TO RISK THEIR LIVES WITHOUT OUR WAVING SOME SYMBOL OF PATRIOTISM. CAN WE, INTELLIGENT AND THINKING MILITARY LEADERS, GET THE REQUIRED PERFORMANCE FROM OUR MEN USING ONLY REASON AND LOGIC--OR DO WE ALL NEED TO WAVE EMOTIONAL SYMBOLS TO PROPEL MEN INTO THE BASICALLY IRRATIONAL ACTS OF WAR? WHAT ARE A MILITARY MAN'S OBLIGATIONS TO RATIONALITY--? TO LOYALTY TO HIS SERVICE, TO HIS COMRADES, TO HIS COUNTRY? WHAT DO WE DO WHEN OUR SENSE OF INTEGRITY AND LOYALTY CONFLICT?

NOW WE ARE BY NO MEANS THE ONLY PERSONS WHO FACE THIS DILEMMA. EVERY BUSINESSMAN HAS HIS PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OR MORALTY BUT THERE IS A BIG DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SAYING:

"WHAT IS GOOD FOR GENERAL MOTORS IS GOOD FOR THE U.S.A."

AND SOMETHING LIKE:

"NATIONAL SECURITY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE PREVENTION OF OUR WAY OF LIFE"

THE FORMER IS USUALLY QUOTED IN DERISION, EVEN THOUGH THERE IS AN ELEMENT OF TRUTH IN IT. THE LATTER HAS A GREAT DEAL OF TRUTH IN IT, BUT HOW MANY TIMES IS IT QUOTED IN SUPPORT OF QUESTIONABLE CAUSES? THAT, IT SEEMS TO ME IS THE ESSENCE OF THE ISSUE OF THE PUBLIC MORALITY OF MILITARY MEN. THAT IS, HOW OFTEN DO WE TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE GREATER FREEDOM THAT MAKING

APPEALS TO PATRIOTISM GIVES US. WE WORK FOR THE STATE. THE FUNDAMENTAL PROPOSITION OF A STATE IS THAT IT ATTEMPTS TO PRESERVE ITSELF AND THEREFORE THE WELL-BEING OF ITS CITIZENS. AS A RESULT WE COMMONLY CONDONE ACTIONS BY A STATE THAT WOULD CONTRAVENE OUR SENSE OF PRIVATE MORALITY. WAR ITSELF IS ONE

EXAMPLE. PURPOSEFUL DECEIT IS ANOTHER. LET US TAKE THE RECENT CASE OF GENERAL LAVELLE, THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF SEVENTH AIR FORCE IN VIETNAM. IT APPEARS THAT HE DECEIVED HIS SUPERIORS AND EXCEEDED HIS AUTHORITY. THIS CLEARLY VIOLATES OUR SENSE OF PRIVATE MORALITY. WHY DID HE DO IT? FOR PERSONAL GAIN OR GLORY? IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT WAY TO ME.

CURIOUSLY, I HAVE NEVER HEARD A NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST SUGGEST IT. THEY HAVE NOT EVEN ASKED THIS QUESTION OR WONDERED WHY HE DID WHAT IT IS AVERRED HE DID DO. THE WRITERS IMMEDIATELY ASSUMED THAT BECAUSE HIS ACTIONS APPARENTLY VIOLATED OUR STANDARDS OF PRIVATE MORALITY, HE WAS DESERVING OF CONDEMNATION. PERHAPS IN GENERAL LAVELLE'S VIEW HE ACTED BECAUSE HIS SENSE OF PUBLIC MORALITY JUSTIFIED WHAT HE DID. PERHAPS HE FELT THAT THE NATION'S INTERESTS WERE ENDANGERED BY PROLONGING THE WAR AND WASTING LIVES BECAUSE OF THE WAY THAT WE WERE FIGHTING?

CAN WE NOT IN SOME SENSE SYMPATHIZE WITH A MAN WHO AT LEAST APPEARED TO BE TRYING TO SERVE HIS NATION'S SECURITY? EVEN PERHAPS ACCEPTING THE RESPONSIBILITY AND RISK OF DISAVOWAL AND

DISHONOR TO ACHIEVE WHAT SEEMED TO HIM TO BE IMPORTANT TO THE COUNTRY.

BUT, TOO, ARE NOT LOYALTY AND OBEEDIENCE THE HIGHEST MILITARY VIRTUES? DO WE NOT AS PROFESSIONALS ABHOR PRECEDENTS THAT BREAK DOWN THE FUNDAMENTAL PRECEPT OF SUBORDINATION IN OUR MILITARY WAY OF LIFE?

AND AT THAT PARTICULAR MOMENT WAS NOT GENERAL LAVELLE CLEARLY RUNNING COUNTER TO WHAT THE CITIZENS OF THE COUNTRY WOULD SUPPORT AS BEING IN THE INTEREST OF THEIR SECURITY? DID HE, THEN, NOT HURT THE IMAGE AND REPUTATION OF OUR ENTIRE PROFESSION, AND IN SO DOING VITALLY DAMAGE OUR ABILITY TO PRESERVE THE SECURITY OF THE NATION?

I SUPPOSE THAT THE KEY QUESTION WHICH WE SHOULD ASK OURSELVES IS: DID GENERAL LAVELLE THINK THROUGH THESE IMPLICATIONS OF HIS ACTIONS BEFORE HE TOOK THEM?

DO EACH OF US CAREFULLY CONSIDER THE POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MORALITY BEFORE WE ACT? ARE WE AWARE THAT WE HAVE CHOICES TO MAKE THAT ARE ONLY BLURRED BY STIRRING SLOGANS SUCH AS "WHAT'S GOOD FOR GENERAL MOTORS ... " OR "NATIONAL SECURITY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE PRESERVATION ... " CAN WE LAY DOWN RULES FOR CONDUCT IN SITUATIONS SUCH AS THAT IN WHICH GENERAL LAVELLE FOUND HIMSELF? WHEN LOYALTY, PROSPECTS FOR PROMOTION, PUBLIC ACCLAIM OR OTHER FACTORS IMPINGE ON WHAT OUR PRIVATE CONSCIENCE TELLS US IS MORAL, OR RIGHT OR LEGAL?

OBVIOUSLY, THERE IS NO EASY ANSWER. IN MY PERSONAL VIEW THERE CAN BE NO RIGID FORMULA.

BE SURE, TOO, THAT YOU APPRECIATE THAT WE ARE NOT TALKING OF ISSUES THAT ARE CONFINED TO FOUR STAR OFFICERS. THESE CONFLICTS OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC MORALITY ARE WITH EACH OFFICER FROM THE DAY HE ACCEPTS HIS COMMISSION. YOU SIMPLY CANNOT LIVE IN AN ATMOSPHERE WHERE THE GLORIOUS PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION PERMITS SOME VIOLATIONS OF PRIVATE MORALITY WITHOUT IT SUBTLY AFFECTING OTHER STANDARDS.

YOU WIVES PLAY A VITAL ROLE IN THIS AREA. WE SPEAK OF THE LONLINESS OF COMMAND--HOW THE OFFICER AT THE TOP WHETHER A DEPARTMENT HEAD ON A DESTROYER, COMMANDING OFFICER OR UNIT COMMANDER, HAS TO MAKE UP HIS OWN MIND. HE CAN'T PASS THE BUCK UPWARDS OR SHOW INDECISIVENESS TO HIS JUNIORS. QUITE OFTEN, IF YOU ARE STATIONED WITH HIM, YOU ARE HIS ONLY SOUNDING BOARD ON SUCH MORAL ISSUES. HOW ARE YOU EQUIPPED TO HELP HIM? WHAT INFLUENCES YOUR VIEWS, A SIMPLISTIC BLACK AND WHITE PICTURE OF GOOD AND EVIL? OR A REALISTIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONFLICTS WHICH EXIST IN THE REAL WORLD IN WHICH YOUR HUSBAND OPERATES?

ONE TYPE OF CONFLICT THAT YOUR HUSBANDS READ ABOUT IS THAT BETWEEN TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE AND | TRADITION--BETWEEN

"WE'VE ALWAYS DONE IT THIS WAY" AND "WHY NOT. . . ." PROFESSOR ELTING MORISON PROVIDED SEVERAL ANECDOTES ALONG THIS LINE IN HIS BOOK. HE WAS AS CRITICAL OF THE CIVILIAN WORLD AS OF THE MILITARY. WHERE IS THE LINE BETWEEN RESISTING IMPROVEMENTS OR THE INEVITABLE, AND MISTAKING CHANGE FOR IMPROVEMENTS. MORISON AVERS THAT THE MILITARY AS AN INSTITUTION IS A SOCIETY THAT INHERENTLY RESISTS CHANGE TOO STUBORNLY.

HIS THEORY IS THAT WE ARE A SMALL SOCIETY UNTO OURSELVES, A CLIQUE; THAT ANY SOCIETY HAS AN INSTINCT FOR SELF-PRESERVATION; AND THAT PEOPLE ARE MORE CONFIDENT OF PRESERVING THEIR STATUS IF THINGS DO NOT CHANGE MUCH. HE HAS SOME CHOICE STORIES THAT SEEM TO BEAR THIS OUT.

ONE OF THESE INVOLVED ONE OF MY PREDECESSORS HERE AS PRESIDENT OF THE WAR COLLEGE, ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS (WHO ALSO HAPPENED TO BE THE FATHER-IN-LAW OF THE AUTHOR OF THE BOOK). AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY CAPTAIN SIMS UNCOVERED A WAY TO MAKE A SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT IN NAVAL GUNNERY. THE NAVY SOCIETY OFFERED ONLY UNREMITTING RESISTANCE. WHY? BECAUSE OUR NAVAL SOCIETY WAS STUPID? OR PROUD? NO-- BECAUSE THE PEOPLE WHO RESISTED HIM IDENTIFIED THE NAVY WITH PARTICULAR EQUIPMENTS AND PROCEDURES THAT WERE PART OF THEIR

OWN PERSONAL EXPERIENCE. THEY SAW A CHALLENGE TO THOSE PARTICULARITIES AS NOTHING LESS THAN A CHALLENGE TO THE NAVY ITSELF AS FAR AS THEY WERE CONCERNED. CAN YOU IMAGINE SOMEONE WALKING IN TODAY AND TELLING US THAT ALL SHIPS ARE OUTMODED?--THAT THERE ARE NEW WAYS TO DO A NAVY'S TASKS? DO YOU THINK THAT OUR NAVAL SOCIETY WOULD RECEIVE HIM WITH OPEN MINDEDNESS AND JOY?

BUT SIMS DID SUCCEED. HOW? HE APPEALED TO AUTHORITY OUTSIDE THE NAVY, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. THIS LED TO A GENERALIZATION BY ADMIRAL MAHAN THAT NO MILITARY SERVICE SHOULD OR COULD UNDERTAKE TO REFORM ITSELF. IT MUST SEEK ASSISTANCE FROM OUTSIDE. DO YOU REALIZE THAT? IS IT TRUE TODAY? DO YOU WANT TO ADMIT THAT WE CANNOT SHAPE OUR OWN DESTINY FROM WITHIN? AND IF WE CAN NOT, HOW IN THE WORLD DO WE OBTAIN THAT OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE? IN INDUSTRY YOU CAN TURN TO SOME OUTSIDER AND INVITE HIM IN, AT THE TOP. WE SELDOM HAVE INFUSED GENERALS OR ADMIRALS FROM OUTSIDE OUR TIGHT LITTLE SOCIETY. IF MORISON AND MAHAN ARE RIGHT, SHOULD WE BRING IN 50% OF EACH YEAR'S CROP OF FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICERS FROM CIVILIAN LIFE? CAN WE DO THAT IN WHAT WE CALL A PROFESSION?

ANOTHER CASE OF RESISTANCE TO CHANGE IN MORISON'S BOOK IS THE AMAZING TALE OF THE USS WAMPANOAG (NAMED FOR AN INDIAN TRIBE FROM THIS PART OF THE COUNTRY). SHE WAS COMMISSIONED IN 1868. SHE WAS STEAM PROPELLED. SHE COULD TRAVEL AT 20 KNOTS, WHICH WAS 5 KNOTS FASTER THAN ANYTHING AFLOAT. THIS IS A 33% SPEED ADVANTAGE. TODAY WE ARE PAYING HUGE SUMS FOR FAR LESSER SPEED ADVANTAGES. WHAT DID WE DO WITH THE WAMPANOAG, A SHIP THAT COULD RUN CIRCLES AROUND ABSOLUTELY ANY OTHER VESSEL AFLOAT? IN 1869, JUST A YEAR AFTER HER COMMISSIONING, WE LAID HER UP AND, LATER STILL, WE SOLD HER. WE DID NOT BUILD A SHIP OF HER SPEED AND MANEUVERABILITY FOR ANOTHER 20 YEARS. WHY? PROFESSOR MORISON SUGGESTS THAT THE NAVY HAD NO CONCEPT OF WHY IT NEEDED SUCH A SHIP. IT HAD NO MISSION INTO WHICH HER CAPABILITIES FITTED. THE REASONS GIVEN FOR ELIMINATING HER WERE SPECIOUS, BUT PERHAPS THE NAVAL SOCIETY WAS ACTUALLY REACTING WITH LOGIC AFTER ALL, AT LEAST UNTIL IT HAD THE FORESIGHT TO SEE WHERE THE NAVY SHOULD BE GOING AND WHETHER IT NEEDED WAMPANOAG.

WHERE DO WE GO NEXT? WHAT ARE TODAY'S ANACHRONISMS? YOUR HUSBANDS, WITH YOUR HELP, ARE GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS. THEY ARE THE ONES WHOSE TASK IT WILL BE TO SET THE COURSE FOR THE MILITARY OF THE FUTURE. TO DO

THIS THEY WILL REQUIRE A FINE KNOWLEDGE, NOT ONLY OF WHERE WE HAVE BEEN AND OF WHAT OUR STRATEGY SHOULD BE, BUT OF HOW BEST TO MOLD TECHNOLOGY AND HARDWARE INTO THESE PLANS. IF A WAMPANOAG SHOWS UP TOMORROW--ON HYDROFOILS OR AS AN AIR CUSHION VEHICLE, OR SUBMERGED--THEY MUST RECOGNIZE IT AND KNOW ITS PLACE. FURTHERMORE, THEY MUST FIND THE MONEY IN OUR COMPETITIVE BUDGET FOR THESE NEW ITEMS AND SELL THEM IN THE WASHINGTON ARENA. THIS BRINGS US TO THE NEXT PORTION OF OUR NAVAL WARFARE COURSE. WE WILL START THE MANAGEMENT STUDY AFTER CHRISTMAS BY ADDRESSING THE NECESSITY FOR DEFINING THE PURPOSES AND THE OBJECTIVES OF MILITARY FORCES--PARTICULARLY OF NAVAL FORCES. YOUR HUSBANDS WILL THEN STUDY THE MACHINATIONS AND NUANCES OF THE BUREAUCRATIC BUDGETARY WORLD THAT SO HEAVILY DEFINES AND CONSTRAINS OUR FORCES.

I AM CONVINCED THAT WE NEED A STRONG MILITARY FORCE, NOT ONE FULL OF MILITARISTIC ANACHRONISMS BUT ONE WHICH IS CREATIVE AND RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF OUR SOCIETY. I AM CONVINCED THAT YOUR HUSBANDS WILL BE BETTER QUALIFIED FOR THIS TASK BY HAVING ATTENDED THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE. AND, MOST IMPORTANT, THE OFFICERS WHOSE WIVES ARE IN THIS AUDIENCE WILL BE BEST QUALIFIED BECAUSE YOU LADIES HAVE CARED ENOUGH ABOUT WHAT THEY ARE DOING TO DEVOTE YOUR PRECIOUS TIME HERE.

LET ME CLOSE WITH A QUOTE FROM A LETTER FROM THE
COMMANDING OFFICER OF A DESTROYER TO A WIFE OF A SEVENTEEN --
Approved For Release 2001/09/05 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003500220001-3

WHO HAD BEEN ABOARD HIS SHIP. THE BOY WAS INTERESTED IN ANNAPOLIS, AND IN THE NAVY AS A CAREER. THE COMMANDING OFFICER DESCRIBED ALL THE JOYS--"THE FUN AND ZEST" -- OF BEING A NAVAL OFFICER. THEN HE CAREFULLY TEMPERED THE ADVERTISING WITH FACTS ON THE HARDSHIPS OF SUCH A CAREER. HERE ARE THE WORDS:

"ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOU ASPIRE TO A SUCCESSFUL CAREER AS AN UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER, YOU MUST THOROUGHLY ENJOY THE PRACTICAL BUSINESS OF GOING TO SEA. SO MUCH SO THAT YOU ARE WILLING TO SPEND NEARLY HALF OF YOUR LIFE AWAY FROM YOUR HOME AND FAMILY. YOU MUST BE WILLING TO PLACE YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO YOUR SHIP ABOVE ALL OTHER DUTIES; AND YOU WILL FIND THAT SHE IS A JEALOUS MISTRESS WITH UNENDING DEMANDS ON YOUR TIME, ENERGIES AND ATTENTIONS. YOU MUST BE ABLE TO BOTH GIVE AND CARRY OUT ORDERS WITH WHICH YOU MAY NOT WHOLEHEARTEDLY AGREE AND, ESPECIALLY IN THE CONTEXT OF TODAY'S SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT, BE WILLING TO ACCEPT THE FACT THAT YOUR CHOSEN PROFESSION MAY NOT BE HELD IN HIGH ESTEEM BY THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE. YOU MUST BELIEVE COMPLETELY IN THE VALUE AND IMPORTANCE OF YOUR COMMITMENT. IF AND WHEN YOU MARRY, IT MUST BE TO A WOMAN WHO HAS UNCOMMON COURAGE AND UNDERSTANDING AND WHO WOULD RATHER HAVE A WHOLE MAN PART OF THE TIME THAN PART OF A MAN ALL THE TIME, FOR SHE WILL BE EXPECTED TO CHEERFULLY ACCEPT EVEN GREATER SACRIFICES THAN YOU."

LADIES, THANK YOU.

John Shy Military Profession

COL Hackworth - article 7/72 Harpers

Leader corps and staff corps

AT Mahan speech 1892 - reopen - NWC

Anything "practical"?

Huntington - best perspective

Expertise - professionalism

Responsibility

Corporateness

Military profession international in scope

Civilian-Military relations vital part

Herman Kahn - Thermonuclear War

Comparison of military profession w/small business

minor inefficiencies

Shy

1850 dividing line in military profession

From end religious warfare in mid 17th to emergence of

states and balance of power and mass technological change

1650-1850

Beginning military bureaucracies

Agents of State

Tech plateau

Nothing like gun power box and major changes after

Basic physical factors changed i.e. Nelson had
carronades and copper bottoms. Other than that, not
much better off than Tourville (?)

Officer corps associated w/aristocracy before this

Shy

1750-1800+ Revolution in military education

before this: apprenticeship

1750 Ecole Militaire

Sant Cyr)	
)	
Sandhurst)	
)	all established by early 1800's
West Point)	
)	
Kriegschule Berlin)	

Each established as reaction to crisis

i.e. Sens fall-behind

i.e. Defeat - French in 1806 vs. Prussia

Aim of school -- attract right people-keep out

aristocrats and keep out ambitious middle calss

All stressed math

What to teach?

Aims-

Produce corps solidarity as well as technical
competence

By 1850:

Schools failed:

1. Split officer corps - ring and non-ring except USNA
2. Overemphasis on math reduced support for schools -

sterile - anti-illectualism

Critics:

- 1) Move to pracitcal - return apprenticeship
- 2) More intellectual - university
- 3) Abolish all military schools

1860's - Schools appeared answer to new technology

Reform of schools

Schools expanded - transition from math to technology

(Upsets Mahan - strategy vice nuts/bolts)

Mahan - asserted - timeless principles of war-
war is science -

School men winning - split two extremes

Technology

& Strategy

Due to disagreements on prupose/method - opponents still
encouraged to oppose entirely -

Three - sided quarrel

Second development in last half of 19th century

Deterioration international relations - in part due terror
nuclear weapons.

Importance military higher - as states feel nuclear weapons
threatened

As symbols not identity

As only ones to solve problem of insecurity

Also see hostility as become higher profile -

as people question whether military men up to responsibility

plus political society unrest and military role in interna-

i.e. counterrevolution image

Changing social position of military officer

men tend conservative

Much of the problem is built-in

No solution - must live with it

(But men -

Portune- good will

John Shay M1 Professn

4/1/73

COL Harkworth - article 7/72 Harpers

Leader corps and staff corps

AT Mahan speech 1892 - reopen - NWC

Anyth - "practical"?

Huntington - best perspective

Expertise - professionalism

Responsibility

Corporateness

M1 prof internat in scope

Civ-mil relations vital part

Herman Kahn - thermo War

Comparison of mil prof w/small business

minor inefficiencies

Shy

1850 dividing line in mil prof

From end relig warfare in mid 17th to emergence of
states and balance pwr and mass tech chng

1650-1850

Beginning mil bureaucracies

Agents of State

Tech plateau

Noth - like gun pwdr bx and major chngs after

Basic phys factors chngd i.e. Nelson had
carronades and copper bottoms other that not
much better off than Tourville (?)

Officer corps assoc w/aristocracy b4 this

Shy

1750-1800 + Revol miled

B4 - apprenticeship

1750 Ecole Militaire

Sant Cyr)	
)	
Sandhurst)	all estab by early 1800's
)	
Wst Pnt)	
)	
Krag Schule Berlin)	

Ea estab as reaction to crisis

ie Sens fall-behind

ie Defeat - Fr 1806 vs Prussia

Aim of school --attrct right people-keep out

aristocrats and keep out ambitious middl class

All stressed math

What to teach?

Aims-

Produc corp solidoirty as well as tech comp

B4 1850

Schls failed

1. Split officer corps - ring and non ring xcept USNA
2. Over emphasis on math reduced support 4 schls -

sterile - anti-illectualism critics

1) Move to practical - return apprenticeship

2) More intellectual - university

3) Abolish all mil schls

1860's - schls appeared ans to new tech

Reform of schls

Schls expand - transition from math to tech

(Upsets Mahan - strategy vice nuts/bolts)

Mahan - asserted - timeless priciples of war-

war is science -

Schl men winning - split to extremes

Tech -

Strategy

Due to disagreements on purpose/method - opponents
still encouraged to oppose entirely -

3 sided quarrel

2nd develop 2nd 1/2 19th

Deteriorat - int reltns - in part due terror nu weep

Importnc mil higher - as states feel nu weep threatened

As symbols not identity

As only ones to solve prob insecurity

Also see hostility - as become higher profile -

as people ? whether mil men up 2 resp

+ pol/soc unrest and mil role in internal order -

i.e. counter revolution image

Chang - soc positn mil off

men tend cons

Much of problem built in

No solutn - must live w/it

(But men.

Partune - good will